

FOR THIRTY DAYS

Police Officer S. W. Giddings Suspended.

AND ALSO REIMANDED

The Blow That Officer S. W. Giddings Gave to a Woman Who Had Been a Victim of His Police Officer's Feelings and Pocketbook.

As the result of striking a man, who rather more than intimidated that he was a liar, Police Officer S. W. Giddings was last night suspended by the Board of Police Commissioners for thirty days and severely reprimanded.

The origin of this excellent officer's difficulties are by this time well known. Mr. Lookins keeps a saloon in Rocketts. This saloon the officer pulled one Sunday in the latter part of November, charging the bar tender, with selling liquor on the Sabbath, and also that the house was a disorderly one.

The case came up in the Police Court the following Monday and in the course of the officer's testimony, Mr. Lookins twice testified that the statement of the witness was false. The evidence was in, Lookins and the officer came out in the street, and after some words the officer struck the saloon man and afterwards threw him down. The officer was taken back by Justice Brown and fined \$2.50 for his action, and then Mr. Lookins endeavored to get the matter before the Police Board, with the result that the chief of police preferred two formal charges against him, one of violating that section of the regulations providing that a policeman shall not use violence on a citizen, and the other, that he behaved in a manner unbecoming an officer.

When the board met all three members, Messrs. W. C. Stuart, M. V. D. Doughty and J. M. Wilson, were present and proceeded at once to business. Mr. Lookins was the first witness. He denied having given the officer any provocation to strike him, and, in fact, denied almost everything that the officer affirmed. While on the stand, the officer was permitted to question him and here are some samples:

"When I told you to get up, you said, 'I am not going to get up, you keep your hands off me, because a man was shot in there just before this other case happened, didn't you say I was a liar?'"

"No, you stated that a man was shot in there just before this other case happened, didn't you say I was a liar?"

"Did you not call me a false on two occasions?"

"No, did you not walk up to me and look me in the face and say 'I know you?'"

"Did you not say to me, 'I will get even with you, you scoundrel?'"

"Did you not say as you went out that gate that you would get even with that scoundrel, and then sue the city?"

"No, did I not take you by the arms and shake you?"

"Did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

"No, did I not throw you down, instead of knocking you down?"

THE MISTERY DEEPENS.

Death of Private Henry Reffett Is Still Unexplained.

It was thought that when the First Kentucky Regiment reached Louisville the mystery surrounding the death of Private Henry Reffett, of Company I, of that organization, would be cleared up, but, on the contrary, it appears only to deepen. The officers of the regiment know nothing of the affair.

From the present outlook, it would seem that there is a poor chance of getting any information from the coroner's inquest next Monday, though, it is said, there is in the city an eye-witness to the affair, who does not come forward and testify because he does not want to be mixed up in the thing, even as a witness.

It is not even known what this man's story is, except that he says he saw one soldier strike another soldier down with a bayonet, and then cover him up with baggage and equipment, saying, as he heaped the stuff on, that he had a great mind to run him through the eye with the bayonet.

This reluctant witness evidently saw something, but the above story fails to explain how Private Reffett became injured. The growing impression is that Brehme and Reffett quarreled, and that they are responsible, each for the other's condition.

The Louisville Courier-Journal of Tuesday contains the following story in connection with the tragedy:

"Officers of the First Regiment disclaim any knowledge of the killing of Private Henry Reffett, of Company I, and the wounding of Henry C. Brehme, of the same company, at Newport News Sunday night."

"Mystery surrounds the tragedy, and no one seems to know any of the details leading to the trouble. Lieut. Col. McKim and other regimental officers were seen last night, but all said that they knew nothing of the affair. They say the soldiers were quarreling, and came to time during the night, and as the exact hour of the killing is not known, it is impossible to fix the responsibility on any one man."

Various theories are advanced by Louisville members. Some think the men fought between themselves. Others are inclined to believe that they were intoxicated and fell on the rocks, sustaining their injuries. One officer said that he had refused to halt at the sentry's command, and that when they tried to push him back, he struck them on the head with a rifle butt, and the sentry had a perfect right to do so."

Whether Reffett was the sentinel on duty at the time and was assaulted by a private attempting to pass him, or whether Reffett was the soldier who developed the intention of returning to the boat and was assaulted by the sentinel has not been clearly established and will not be until the witnesses are found.

Private Brehme is still confined to the hospital at Fort Monroe. He is improving slowly and is beyond danger. It is expected that he will be able to leave for home next week.

SAID HE WAS ROBBED.

J. W. Turner Makes a Charge and the Officers Make the Arrests.

Among those who came to the Police Court yesterday on business was J. W. Turner, who said that he had been robbed of \$30 in Fitzgerald's saloon, on Twenty-fifth street, and charged John F. Fitzgerald, James Simpson and Fred Wright with being the parties implicated in it. He claimed that he went to the saloon to pass away the time and was pressed to take a drink, and that after refusing several times, he finally took two, paying for the round with a five-dollar bill, which he took from a roll of greenbacks.

Then he was urged to take another drink, and after awhile, did take a soda, which he began to feel queer, and presently was "knocked out" completely. He knew no more till he came to after being held for some time. Warrants were issued for the parties named, and later on Officers Crawford and Mitchell arrested them and locked them up, having had a very exciting chase for Wright and Simpson.

They will be given a hearing in the Police Court this morning.

CITY NEWS IN BRIEF.

Mr. Thomas Ryan, of Norfolk, is the most of friends in the city.

Mr. Thomas Pugh and family have moved from Manchester to this city.

Mr. R. S. Kirby, a prominent attorney of Staunton, Va., is in the city.

Miss Leonie Dunn has returned from a visit to friends on the Eastern shore.

Miss Sadie Bullock, of the Danville, is the guest of Mrs. Edwards on Twenty-fifth street.

Miss Bell Cleveland, of Portsmouth, is the guest of the Misses Claiborne, in East End.

Mr. W. Claiborne left Tuesday for a short visit to her former home in Baltimore.

The wind blew at the rate of forty-two miles an hour at Cape Henry Tuesday.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Tweedle, who have been visiting relatives in Richmond, have returned to the city.

Miss Margaret Shepherd, who has been visiting Miss Grace Atlee for the past two weeks, left this morning for her home in Manchester.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Magregor, who went to Philadelphia to attend the funeral of Mrs. Magregor's mother, have returned to the city.

The funeral of Prof. M. N. Branch occurred at 2 o'clock yesterday at the home of the dead man's brother at Indiana, Va.

REAL ESTATE CIRCLES

New Home for Pabst Brewing Company's Branch.

SOUTH SIDE TRANSAC.

This is the Last Sold to a Real Estate Firm Will Build for Renting Purposes.

Lease of Property Other Transfers.

The Pabst Brewing Company's branch in this city is soon to have a new home. The company has acquired from Mr. C. J. Kelly, of Washington, D. C., the two lots formerly owned by that gentleman at the intersection of Twenty-sixth street and the railroad, paying for the property \$1,900.

These lots, together, are fifty by a hundred feet and are considered very valuable for the purpose to which the company has proposed to put them. Plans for the new buildings have not been decided upon, but it will probably be considerably larger than the present structure on Twenty-fourth street, which, upon the completion of the new building, will be rented or sold.

THE NORTH END MISSION.

Plans and specifications for the new North End Baptist Mission in this city are now ready, and the bids will probably be opened about the middle of the week. The edifice, which will cost from \$1,000 to \$1,200, will be erected upon the corner of Lafayette avenue and Forty-fifth street, and will be thirty-four by fifty-four feet.

PROPERTY LEASED.

A lease was entered in the clerk's office yesterday from F. P. Finch and M. A. Finch to Amelia Fitzsimmons and Amelia M. Walker, the property located at the intersection of Washington avenue and Twenty-fifth street, the term of the lease being December 13, 1923. The consideration was \$360 for the first five years and the yearly sum of \$720 during the remaining thirty-five years.

THE FOLLOWING DEEDS OF BARGAIN AND SALE WERE ENTERED FOR RECORD IN THE CORPORATION COURT CLERK'S OFFICE YESTERDAY: W. E. Barrett and wife to Rebecca M. Smith, two lots, consideration, \$5,000. W. Lee Powell to Geo. W. Diggs, one lot, consideration, \$1,000.

LEARN-FAYFIELD.

Pretty Home Marriage of a Popular Couple Yesterday.

A pretty home wedding took place yesterday afternoon at 4:15 o'clock at the residence of Mrs. J. P. Lear, 2810 Lafayette avenue, Missing the marriage of his daughter, Miss Lillie Pearl, to Mr. Chas. Spencer Rayfield.

The house was artistically decorated with holly and cedar. Miss Minnie Blynn, his maid of honor and Mr. John Rayfield, the groom's brother, acted as best man. The ceremony was performed by Rev. M. S. Colonna, Jr., pastor of the East End M. E. church.

The bride was married in a traveling suit of pearl gray, with hat and gloves to match. The happy couple left on the train for Essex of the Merchant and Miners Transportation Company for an extended northern tour. The bride is one of Newport News' most popular young ladies. The groom is a trusted employee of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company.

THAT INJUNCTION.

Proceedings Continued Until Next Saturday in the Corporation Court.

The argument on the petition of the Newport News and Old Point Railway and Electric Company to have the injunction obtained by the city against its dissolution, was heard yesterday in the Corporation Court. The case had to be postponed until next Saturday owing to the fact that two of the attorneys in the case were absent. Mr. Segar being in New York and ex-Governor Carroll in Richmond.

Appearing for the railroad and Commonwealth's Attorney Newton for the city.

The street committee will meet Friday night and it is probable that the action of this body will have some bearing on the proceedings in court the following day. The committee will also consider matters connected with proposed change in the grade of the approaches to the proposed bridges over the railroad.

BAINES-BUTLER.

Pretty Home Marriage of a Popular Couple.

Mr. C. W. Baines, the popular stenographer in the government department of the shipyard, and Miss Nettie Butler, the charming daughter of Mr. C. W. Butler, formerly in the hardware business in this city, but now residing near Toana, were united in marriage yesterday afternoon at 3:30 o'clock at the home of the bride, Rev. I. S. Boyle, of Williamsburg, officiating. After the ceremony, which was attended by only the intimate friends of the family, Mr. and Mrs. Baines took the train for Richmond, from which city they will extend their bridal tour northward.

Both Mr. Baines and his bride are favorites in Newport News, and their many friends wish them sincerely a long life and much happiness.

We desire to inform the citizens of Newport News that we carry a very complete line of Mantels, both wood and slate in all designs. The hearths in the very latest patterns, also grates and the celebrated Richardson & Boynton Lathrop Heaters. We have the most beautiful patterns in all grades of wall paper. We keep open until 8:30 P. M. and can convince the public that they can save money by buying all interior decorations from us. W. T. Patton & Co., 212 Twenty-seventh street. de 8-17

DISCUSS CANAL BILL

Senator Harris Pronounce the Project Impracticable.

HAS STRONG CHAMPIONS

Attempt to Bring Up in Lodge Immigration Bill is Frustrated in the House, Lively Passing as Am. Over the Rules.

To Which Speaker Joins.

(By Telegraph.)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14.—The Nicaragua canal bill held its place as the principal subject before the Senate yesterday, and the House, after a long session, passed the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. Harris spoke on the general features of the bill. He said that as a boy he was attached to a surveying party on the isthmus, in 1859, and ever since that time he had been a zealous advocate of the general proposition that a canal should be built across the isthmus. Still, he did not think it practically a private corporation to construct the canal and urged government ownership.

THINKS IT IMPRACTICABLE.

Mr. Harris said that he considered the Panama canal entirely impracticable. He supported Mr. Berry's amendment relieving the bill of its bond provisions, saying it would greatly improve the measure.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty formed the basis of a brief speech by Mr. Money. He advocated delay in order to afford opportunity for negotiations looking to the abrogation of the treaty. Mr. Money said we should at least notify the United States in perpetuity to the contrary of the treaty, as a first step. In this connection, he referred to the entente cordiale existing between the United States and England, saying that he wanted to see the two nations brought even closer together than now. Hence, the importance of dealing fairly and courteously with Great Britain in this important matter.

ANOTHER AMENDMENT.

Mr. Bacon gave notice of an amendment to the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

DISCUSS CANAL BILL

Senator Harris Pronounce the Project Impracticable.

HAS STRONG CHAMPIONS

Attempt to Bring Up in Lodge Immigration Bill is Frustrated in the House, Lively Passing as Am. Over the Rules.

To Which Speaker Joins.

(By Telegraph.)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14.—The Nicaragua canal bill held its place as the principal subject before the Senate yesterday, and the House, after a long session, passed the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. Harris spoke on the general features of the bill. He said that as a boy he was attached to a surveying party on the isthmus, in 1859, and ever since that time he had been a zealous advocate of the general proposition that a canal should be built across the isthmus. Still, he did not think it practically a private corporation to construct the canal and urged government ownership.

THINKS IT IMPRACTICABLE.

Mr. Harris said that he considered the Panama canal entirely impracticable. He supported Mr. Berry's amendment relieving the bill of its bond provisions, saying it would greatly improve the measure.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty formed the basis of a brief speech by Mr. Money. He advocated delay in order to afford opportunity for negotiations looking to the abrogation of the treaty. Mr. Money said we should at least notify the United States in perpetuity to the contrary of the treaty, as a first step. In this connection, he referred to the entente cordiale existing between the United States and England, saying that he wanted to see the two nations brought even closer together than now. Hence, the importance of dealing fairly and courteously with Great Britain in this important matter.

ANOTHER AMENDMENT.

Mr. Bacon gave notice of an amendment to the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

DISCUSS CANAL BILL

Senator Harris Pronounce the Project Impracticable.

HAS STRONG CHAMPIONS

Attempt to Bring Up in Lodge Immigration Bill is Frustrated in the House, Lively Passing as Am. Over the Rules.

To Which Speaker Joins.

(By Telegraph.)

WASHINGTON, Dec. 14.—The Nicaragua canal bill held its place as the principal subject before the Senate yesterday, and the House, after a long session, passed the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. Harris spoke on the general features of the bill. He said that as a boy he was attached to a surveying party on the isthmus, in 1859, and ever since that time he had been a zealous advocate of the general proposition that a canal should be built across the isthmus. Still, he did not think it practically a private corporation to construct the canal and urged government ownership.

THINKS IT IMPRACTICABLE.

Mr. Harris said that he considered the Panama canal entirely impracticable. He supported Mr. Berry's amendment relieving the bill of its bond provisions, saying it would greatly improve the measure.

The Clayton-Bulwer treaty formed the basis of a brief speech by Mr. Money. He advocated delay in order to afford opportunity for negotiations looking to the abrogation of the treaty. Mr. Money said we should at least notify the United States in perpetuity to the contrary of the treaty, as a first step. In this connection, he referred to the entente cordiale existing between the United States and England, saying that he wanted to see the two nations brought even closer together than now. Hence, the importance of dealing fairly and courteously with Great Britain in this important matter.

ANOTHER AMENDMENT.

Mr. Bacon gave notice of an amendment to the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.

Mr. Stewart advocated the bill as a most important step in the progress of the canal project. He said that the bill, providing that work should not be begun on the canal until the government of Nicaragua should consent to a modification of the treaty granting title to the United States in perpetuity to the canal right of way and also eliminating articles 53 and 54 of the concession from that document.